

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claims 3-4 and 17-18 include allowable subject matter that would be allowable if rewritten as suggested in the Office Action.

By the above amendment, claims 1, 4, 13, 15 and 18 have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 14, 16 and 17 have been canceled without prejudice. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Drawing Objections

The drawings were objected to for not disclosing the features of "grooves" and "slots" as claimed in claims 9 and 10, respectively. Applicant respectfully traverses the drawing objection on the grounds that under 37 CFR 1.81 and 35 U.S.C. 113, there is no requirement that a drawing be furnished to illustrate claimed subject matter in circumstances where the claimed subject matter can be understood without the drawings. By virtue of the claim rejections set forth on pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action, for example, the Examiner apparently recognizes that various techniques (such as clips, slots, grooves, etc.) for attaching tool holders to work belts are well known in the art, and cites several references in this regard. Therefore, the record establishes that at the very least, the subject matters of claims 9 and 10 are understandable without resort to specific illustration. Accordingly, withdrawal of the drawing objections is requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 2, 3, 16 and 17 are objected to due to the inclusion of terms "d1" and "d2". The claims have been amended to remove these terms. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections is requested.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 14 was found to be indefinite due to the inclusion of the term "transverse". The claims have been amended to remove this term. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 112 rejection is requested.


Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102 and 103

Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with the claim rejections, the claims have been amended for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and placing the application in condition for allowance. For example, claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matters of canceled claims 2 and 3. Essentially, claim 1 is claim 3 rewritten in independent form, and is thus allowable for those reasons given in the Office Action. Claim 4 has been amended to change its dependency from canceled claim 3 to claim 1.

Moreover, claim 13 has been amended to include the subject matters of canceled claims 14, 16 and 17. Essentially, claim 13 is claim 17 rewritten in independent form, and is thus allowable for those reasons given in the Office Action. Claims 15 and 18 have been amended to change their dependency to amended claim 13.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 13, and all pending claims that depend from claims 1 and 13, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Frank V. DeRosa
Reg. No. 43,584

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL.: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889